



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

MANY MOODS IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES.

To both Jewish and Christian orthodoxy of a hundred years ago all the writers of the Old Testament spoke a single mind. All were supposed to hold the same opinions, to teach and to cling to the same ideals. The conception of God which seemed true to Moses was the same conception which satisfied Isaiah, and one view of man's relation to the divine expressed the sentiments both of Jeremiah and of Ezra. It is criticism which has restored to the Bible its original variety of life and colour. Just as in the human structure the inter-connection of mind and matter is so much more complex than was supposed erewhile, so, too, in the Bible, the human and divine elements are far more subtly transfused than the pious simplicity of an earlier age believed. It is through the very variety of its human aspect that what we call the inspiration of the Bible is now recognised and revered.

Yet there are two ways in which this variety is limited. One is that because it is a collection of the religious and historical writings of a single race, the Bible (by which term I here mean the Old Testament only) takes for granted throughout one or two fundamental religious convictions, from which it never deflects. That Yahveh is the God of Israel, and that Yahveh is a God of righteousness,—these are assertions which, however differently they might be expressed, and whatever difference in implication they might contain for different ages and minds, would never have been flatly contradicted by any Israelite from David to Judas the Maccabee. This limitation is obvious and familiar; the other, though undoubtedly very important, is as yet of unascertained range. We may call it the editorial limitation, and it shows itself in different ways. Certain functions of the Old Testament editors have only quite recently been more narrowly inquired into; and till the criticism of Stade and his school has been systematically examined, there must remain considerable doubt in many important details relating to this work of the Biblical editors.¹ Its method, how-

¹ I refer especially to their work in Stade's excellent *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Into the field of this criticism it should be noted that Geiger led the way. Compare the *Uebersetzung* chapter in his *Urschrift*, pp. 72-101.

ever, is already clear. Much of it is comprised in that useful German word, for which unfortunately we have no English equivalent, *Uebersetzung*. The historical books provide the best field for these critical investigations. Their results we see most satisfactorily in those chapters of Samuel in which a clearly primitive train of thought is rounded off or interlarded with far later reflections and ideas. How much the editors may have omitted from their originals we cannot tell; it is very probable that many a passage, into which even they could not read their own religious convictions, was left out or greatly modified. Even in the prophetic writings we have, though with reserve, to be on the watch for the editor's hands. Not merely, as almost everybody nowadays is aware, are whole chapters appended to one prophet's utterances which belong to a different age (*e.g.*, Isaiah xl.-lxvi., Zechariah ix.-xiv.), but even within single chapters a careful, though sometimes too subtle, criticism has shown with more or less convincing exactitude the presence of editorial accretions. If then an attempt is made to prove an identity of thought between, let us say, Jeremiah and Ezra, by the help of a few verses from the former which are used to counterbalance a number of other passages which ordinarily would suggest a considerable difference between these two writers, we must first be sure that the argument of the harmonist is not resting upon the precarious foundation of an editorial comment or gloss. On the other hand, the existence of isolated passages such as Isaiah lvi. 1-8, or writings with a partly polemical purpose, such as Jonah and Ruth, suggest a doubt whether many noble utterances may not have been curtailed or suppressed by over-zealous editors with whose religious position they were not in harmony.

The actual variety of thought in the Biblical writings in their present form may be roughly classified as follows. First, a variety that indicates and illustrates a development in time of moral and religious thought from lower to higher. But within this category we cannot include all species of difference. Nehemiah is later than the "second Isaiah," but he is spiritually his inferior. Secondly, a variety that is partially explained by the fact that the authors of Scripture fall into three or four different classes. The prophets, the wise men, the priests and the psalmists had all, to some extent, their own special points of view, and there are writings in the Bible, such as Deuteronomy or Ezekiel or Psalm cxix., which represent a more or less perfect fusion between two of these different classes. Lastly, there remains all the variety that may be due to the individual idiosyncrasy and character of each particular writer.

I.

I propose to illustrate the many moods of the Scriptures by a few salient examples; sufficiently familiar as they are to the scholar, they still need interpretation to the "general reader."

The variety, which is mainly due to upward development, is well shown in the progressive conceptions of God.

Monotheism in Israel did not spring full fledged into existence. It was only gradually that the patron deity of the nation was transformed into the sole and only God in heaven and upon earth. M. Renan, indeed, would have us believe that among the old patriarchal ancestors of the Hebrews there was already prevalent a kind of primitive monotheism. The nameless Elohim (gods) they worshipped were easily combinable into a single Elohim (God), "whose breath is the life of the universe."¹ The introduction of the worship of Yahveh as the national God was a downward religious step. Centuries were needed before Yahveh, the cruel, jealous and partial Deity, could be disrobed of his own peculiar attributes, and endowed with the higher qualities of the patriarchal Elohim. But M. Renan's theory is still unproved. And seeing that it is inconsistent with the safest conclusions of comparative religious study, we may abide in the belief that the pre-Mosaic conception of deity, of which Stade, with perhaps too sweeping a negative, declares that we know nothing, was not higher than the Mosaic, but lower,² and that the recognition of Yahveh as the sole God of Israel marks a gigantic religious advance. Moreover, the exclusive worship of Yahveh, when once acknowledged as the religious duty of Israel, became the stepping-stone to monotheism. It was the monolatry offered to Yahveh which turned the plurality of the word Elohim from a living reality into a mere grammatical archaism.

It seems strange and even sad that the two terms which the Jews, the monotheists *par excellence*, use to designate God should carry upon the face of them the evidence of a polytheistic origin.³ The very substitution of the true pronunciation

¹ Renan *Histoire d'Israel*, Vol. I., Chapters ii.-iv., which repeat his old theory of the primitive monotheism of the Semites in the famous *mémoire* in the *Journal Asiatique* of 1859.

² Compare Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I., pp. 130, 140, 515. Kuenen, *Drie wegen, één Doel. Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1888, p. 473ff.

³ Besides the use of Elohim for alien and heathen deities, compare the curious passage in Judges, "Should I (*i.e.* the olive) leave my fatness, which gods and men in me do glorify, to go to wave over the trees?" (Judges ix. 9). Q. P. B. = *Queen's Printers' Bible*, a work which every general reader of the Bible, as well as every scholar, should possess. A new and revised edition has just appeared.

Yahveh in the place of the old rendering *Jehovah* gives a peculiar shock to our religious sentiment. *Jehovah*, by the lapse of ages and the influence of faith, has almost become synonymous with God. But when for that familiar, and therefore unsuggestive word, we read *Yahveh*, we are painfully sensible of the inevitable implication. *Yahveh* though perhaps etymologically, and certainly historically, at a comparatively early date, a worthy and lofty designation for God, is nevertheless only a proper name, of the same class as the proper names of other gods of other nations. A name is far remote from our conception of the Deity. Naming implies particularisation: he who is the sole representative of his class stands in no need of having his identity secured by the help of a particular appellation. Yet however much *Yahveh* in the eyes of a David or a Solomon was superior to other gods, he was not regarded as the only Divine Power. *Yahveh* had to pass from being the god of a tribe, before being recognized as the Universal Deity of all mankind. It is natural that these lower conceptions as they peep out from the oldest historical records, which even in their present form are in this respect still imperfectly edited, should frequently present many unattractive features. Upon these it is unnecessary to dwell in detail; a few examples will serve our purpose sufficiently.

The localisation of *Yahveh* strikes us especially. There are signs that he was first thought to reside habitually upon Mount Sinai,¹ while later, Palestine becomes his permanent dwelling-place. On this point it suffices merely to refer to such repeatedly quoted passages as 2 Samuel xiv. 16, Exodus xv. 17, Hosea ix. 3, etc.²

At other times the ark is superstitiously identified with God, as in 1 Samuel vi. (cp. Numbers x. 33-36), the ideas in which chapter may be contrasted both with Jeremiah's view of the ark (iii. 16) and with God's residence by grace in the sanctuary at Jerusalem, according to Ezekiel, the *Priest-coder*, and the temple Psalms. "Heaven," in which a modern child's faith localises God, became his dwelling-place for the Hebrews also, but at what date is uncertain.³ For a later age heaven itself becomes unable to contain God, and the Divine

¹ Compare Exodus xix. 4, Deut. xxxiii. 2, and Dillmann's Commentary, *ad loc.*; Judges v. 4, etc.; Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 447; Wellhausen, *Proleg.*, p. 344, E.T.

² Compare now for the whole of this subject Robertson Smith's Lectures on the Religion of the Semites. First Series, Lecture III.

³ Compare Stade, *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 446.

Universality is nowhere more magnificently proclaimed than in Solomon's Prayer (1 Kings viii. 27), and Psalm cxxxix.¹

Jephtah's Yahveh in an illustrative, but over emphasised passage Judges xi. 24 (Q. P. B.), is not conspicuously different in capacity and range of interest from the god of the Moabite stone. Yet this is the Yahveh whose house shall be called an house of prayer for all peoples. How great the change! The spirit of the one Yahveh drives its possessor to slay a thousand of the Philistines (Judges xv. 15); the spirit of the other impels to preach good tidings to the meek, and to bind up the broken-hearted (Isaiah lxi. 1).

Still, as these very extracts from the book of Isaiah prove, it is Yahveh, not Elohim, of whom these things are said, and Yahveh is not a mere synonym for God. Yahveh is the God revealed in history; or rather he is the God revealed in Israel's history. Israel's God is the God of Prophecy, not the more abstract, if more philosophical, God of humanity at large.

But it is clear that the conception of God in the books of the "Wise" indicates a different kind of religious progress to that achieved by the Prophets. It does not affect the truth of this proposition that in Proverbs God is usually called Yahveh. Though addressed under this name, the God of Proverbs is not so much the God of Israel as the God of the individual or the world. Unfortunately the dates of both Job and Proverbs still remain uncertain. The possible influence of the "Wise Men" upon the work of the Prophets must therefore also remain for the present a very doubtful quantity.² A certain lack of religious ardour seems traceable in the writings of the Wise. In spite of the glorification of wisdom, we seem to miss the intimacy of religious sentiment as expressed in many of the Psalms. The Prophets were naturally more conscious of a close relationship to God. Sentences like "I dwell with him that is of a humble and contrite spirit" or "the Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon him," seem more in place in Isaiah or the Psalms than they would be in Proverbs, Job, or Ecclesiastes. It is probable that the lack of warmth and *Innigkeit* in the Preacher's references to God is explainable from the temperament of the man and the sad circumstances of his age, whereas in Job and Proverbs these deficiencies, if they are more real than apparent, are to be ascribed to the nature and limits of the class of literature to which they

¹ It is, therefore, not true, as Stade (*Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 467) would imply, that Acts xvii. 24 taught something till then unknown to any Jew.

² Cheyne (Job and Solomon, p. 123) rates their influence high even in the pre-exilic period. A very late date is given to Proverbs by Holtzmann, Stade's continuer and disciple, in *Geschichte* II., p. 292, and by Stade himself, p. 216.

belong. When, however, a very late date is assigned to Proverbs and Job, as well as to the Preacher, the lateness of whose age is certain, the supposed lack of warmth in their conceptions of God becomes additionally important, for it is then brought into connection with a general theory that has become a commonplace among most critical theologians. The theory is that in proportion as the conception of Yahveh became purified from the earlier anthropomorphisms, or, speaking from a modern point of view, as the change proceeded from Yahveh to Elohim, God became more distant and transcendent, and his relation to man colder and less intimate. It is supposed that the change is first noticeable in Ezekiel, and that this "false transcendentalism" became more and more the customary and ordinary manner of conceiving God among the "Scribes" and "Pharisees." The necessary corrective was then supplied, so it is assumed, by the life and teaching of Jesus, and theologically at a later age by the theory of the three *ὑποστάσεις* or *Personæ* in the single Godhead. Now, I should be the last to deny that the idea of God, formed by an ethical and religious genius of the first order such as Jesus, was indefinitely higher and more intimate than could be formed by a far smaller personality, such as the author of Ecclesiastes or of the book of Tobit. Nor do I deny that the theory of the Trinity (at a great sacrifice of the purity of the divine idea for nine-tenths of those who have accepted it) has kept in view and put prominently forward certain relations of the Deity to man and to the world, without which the whole conception of God loses half its value and half its truth. But it is I hope not merely an hereditary and therefore unconscious Jewish prepossession which makes me protest against the too frequent habit of misusing and misinterpreting certain portions of the Old Testament and of the later Jewish literature as a contrast and foil to Christianity. What a gratuitous unfairness it surely is when Professor Schultz, after conceding that the conception of God in the apocryphal books is usually agreeably free from the crudities and sensuous forms which mar the purity of the older ideas, goes on to say that this greater purity is in the last resort not the expression of a higher religious development, but the result of spiritual exhaustion (Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 4th edition, p. 507). This is a mere statement of opinion unsupported by evidence; whereas that the intimate relation of God to Israel, and even to every individual Israelite, is a characteristic of the whole Talmudic period might be convincingly proved. The "false transcendentalism" (except perhaps in such writers as

Koheleth, or in regular philosophers like Philo) is a figment of the theologians' brains. It is perfectly true that God is conceived as far removed from every human weakness or limitation; and it is also true that he is distinguished from the world which he has created and rules; but as to the first point, it is surely not an error but a truth, and as to the second, it is the necessary characteristic of every simple faith, whether Jewish or Christian. No pantheistic God has ever received, or will ever receive, the prayer and worship of ordinary humanity. Christian theologians usually write in comparative unfamiliarity with the literature they specially decry; they cannot work themselves into sympathy with its frequent strangeness of speech, while they are still more unfamiliar with living specimens of piety, bred and nurtured upon exclusively Rabbinic lines. Otherwise they would see for themselves that whatever may be the faults of the individual religion of people such as these, lack of warmth and intimacy in their conception of and communion with God is certainly not among the number.

In another respect also the Talmudic idea of God is more akin to that of the Prophets than to that of Ecclesiastes. By the author of Ecclesiastes, so far as we can judge, God was not habitually regarded as standing in a special relation to Israel; he is Elohim, not Yahveh. To the Talmudists he is Yahveh still, though they do not pronounce his name.¹ For us to-day the idea of God is not so easy. We have to make his Elohim aspect the basis of our conception; then only can we transmute it with all those essential qualities, without their limitations (does not this roughly equal the substitution of mankind for Israel?), that made the word Yahveh precious and significant to the Psalmists and the Seers.

II.

The many moods of Scripture can also be illustrated by the varying conceptions of God's relation to Israel and to other nations. The ordinary pre-prophetic idea is aptly expressed by the passages in Judges and Samuel already alluded to. It is the tolerant attitude of conventional paganism. Each nation has its own special God and is thus religiously in-

¹ The pronouncing Adonai for Yahveh is usually put down to a "Pharisaic" superstition. If it be so, we can be grateful to the superstition, since a name for God had to be given up. Yet since the basis of the alleged superstition is that Yahveh is not a mere name, but expresses in a mysterious way the essence or true nature of God, the "superstition" is surely religiously higher than the frank utterance of Yahveh as an ordinary appellation.

dependent of every other nation. This view was even in later times shaken off with difficulty, but its character was modified. It then became a conscious dislike or neglect of the lofty Prophetic visions—a religious selfishness: the other nations may worship their false gods, if they please, we will enjoy our privilege of adoring Yahveh, the true God. This is, I fancy, the thought expressed in a verse of Micah, appended, perchance, as a side note or reflection by a narrow-minded scribe to a solemn universalistic prophecy, and then by a strange, though not unusual, fate incorporated into the text: “for all the peoples shall walk every one in the name of his God, but we will walk in the name of Yahveh, our God, for ever and ever” (Micah iv. 5).

How are we to account on any non-theistic hypothesis for the extraordinary change from the conception of Jephthah to that of the Babylonian Isaiah? Did ever a God become so exclusively identified with a people, did ever a people become so exclusively identified with a God, as Yahveh with Israel and Israel with Yahveh? Israel is Yahveh’s particular people, and Yahveh is their sole and particular God. He is Israel’s pride and glory, and in another sense, his glory and pride are centred in Israel. And yet out of this very particularism springs the universalism of the later Prophets. How did this change come about? Excluding the influence of external events, the relations to Assyria and the other great monarchies of Asia, its great internal cause lay in the peculiar character of the nation’s God, as the best spirits of the people, so far back as the eye of history can range, conceived him. Yahveh is a God of power and of jealousy; he is greater than the other gods; he cannot tolerate them beside him, and so at last he comes to be the only God, and all other divine powers in the universe are at most his ministers and attendants. And secondly, Yahveh is a God of righteousness, and therefore whatever his relations to other peoples beyond Israel in present, past, or future, they must be relations which are founded and shaped by the ruling law of righteousness.

That one God among many should become the patron deity of a single people presents no difficulty where a plurality of gods is assumed. It is no hard matter that each deity looks after the interests of his own clients. But a covenant or peculiar relation of grace between the only God on one side, and a particular nation on the other, is almost bound to produce its religious antinomies. That the only God should single out one particular nation as his special property, though leaving, perchance, the others to the care of his own angelic

servitors,¹ obviously demands some very peculiar and unusual explanation, if it is to be adequately reconciled with divine impartiality. Such an explanation could not be given to it so long as Israel was still a nation among the nations. The idea of the covenant could only be stripped of its danger, and yet maintain its value, when the religious community took the place of the nation, when Israelites became complete citizens of other lands than Palestine, and when the altruistic view of Israel's relation to God became finally predominant. In other words, the idea of the covenant could not be realised in all its purity until modern times.

That God and Israel are specially related to each other, and that Israel, if it observes the conditions of the agreement, is to reap enormous benefit, both temporal and spiritual, from this relationship, is a fundamental assumption of the Old Testament writers. Why God chose Israel and for what end, were naturally questions that did not very often suggest themselves to the national consciousness. The covenant must be obeyed, that its advantages might be enjoyed; there was no need to question or explain. If the nation had properly fulfilled its own part of the agreement, the prophetic writers would scarcely have even thrown out the fragmentary ideas upon the subject that we can now discover. Thus, for instance, the benefits which God showered down upon an ungrateful people are sometimes ascribed to the excellence of the Patriarchs, and to the necessity which God was under of fulfilling his word of promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Deuteronomy declares that it was not as a reward for righteousness that God had brought the Israelites in to possess Canaan, but partly because of the wickedness of the Canaanite nations, and partly as a confirmation of the oath to the fathers (Deut. ix. 4; compare Genesis xv. 16). In another passage, the author asserts that God's choice of Israel was made because he loved him. In a far later teacher the choice comes dangerously near to caprice. "Was not Esau Jacob's brother; yet I loved Jacob and hated Esau" (Malachi i. 2).² Far nobler is the explanation of Exodus xix. 6: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." These words seem almost to imply that the election of Israel is for the good of others as well as for his own. Equally

¹ Compare Deut. xxxii. 8, in the LXX. reading. Dillmann, however (Nu. Dt. Jo., p. 398), denies the originality of this reading, and thinks the whole idea much later. Compare also Stade, Vol. II., p. 239, and Cheyne on Isaiah xxiv. 21.

² Contrast with Malachi's hatred of Edom the kindlier feeling of the Deuteronomist, ii. 5, 8, 29, xxiii. 7, and compare Schulz, p. 748, fourth edition.

noble are the words of Genesis xviii. 19, where a moral purpose is clearly assigned to Israel's prerogative¹: "I have taken notice of him (Abraham) that he may command his children and his household after him so that they keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment." In the Babylonian Isaiah there are three reasons given for Israel's primacy. The first is the reason of all things, the glory of God, who by the witnessing of Israel and his apostolic services is exalted among mankind. Secondly, comes Israel itself and its own future grandeur. The Covenant is a gift of grace, bringing a rich guerdon with it. And lastly, the election of Israel, or rather of the servant in whom all that is best in Israel is personified, is for the world's sake. Israel is to be a light to the nations, and God's salvation unto the end of the earth.

I admit that this method of explaining Israel's special relation to God is elsewhere unparalleled; but none the less, isolated as the explanation is, it has triumphed over all lower ideas, and unquestionably represents to-day the ripened doctrine of the synagogue.

The older prophets do not generally concern themselves with other nations, except in so far as these are related to Israel. Here it is that the religious danger comes in. When, for example, one nation is at war with the other, each always thinks itself in the right, and even in modern times demands the special protection of God. In old Israel this natural feeling implied much more. In the last resort it implied that, as Yahveh must be on the side of Israel, in doing injury to Israel the offending nation had also sinned against Yahveh. It is unnecessary to quote examples of so familiar a theme. Even Babylon, the minister of God's wrath upon Judah, was supposed to have sinned against Yahveh, because she not unnaturally imagined that her own strength had wrought the victory. During and after the exile the enmity to the nations deepens. Before that time the prophets mainly, if not exclusively,² directed their denunciations against certain definite countries; but afterwards, Ezekiel being here, as in so many other things, the pioneer of later developments, the "nations," as a collective plural, became identified with the enemies of Israel. The Israelites in the later (mainly Maccabean?) psalms are the righteous, the

¹ The date of Genesis xviii. 19 and xv. 16 is disputed. See Dillmann, *Genesis*, fifth edition, upon the former passage.

² Stade notoriously regards an allusion to "many nations" as an almost certain mark of a later authorship. Compare his essays in his *Zeitschrift* upon Zech. ix.-xiv., Micah iv.-vii., etc., and Ryssel's Micah.

"nations" are the wicked. The Lord's day is to be ushered in by an awful judgment upon the nations, the enemies of God and of his chosen people.

This punishment of the nations which, according to the principle of righteous retribution, must be caused by their sinfulness, is partly accounted for by their hostility to Israel. This, however, is not the only cause which is mentioned. Their very ignorance of the true God is made a reproach against them. Idolatry is not only a sin in Israel, but also in the nations at large. So in a (probably unauthentic) passage in Jeremiah the fury of Yahveh is invoked upon "the nations that know him not, and upon the families that call not on his name." The view that idolatry is conscious apostasy is cleverly elaborated in the Wisdom of Solomon (xiii. and xiv.).

On the other hand Amos, the oldest of the literary prophets, bases the ruin of Moab upon an act of barbarism committed not upon Israel, but upon Edom. To him apparently the nations' ignorance of Yahveh is no offence, though all peoples are under God's immediate providence. "Are ye not as the children of the Ethiopians unto me, O children of Israel? saith the Lord. Have I not brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Syrians from Kir?" (ix. 7).¹

How powerful must have been the force of religious inspiration for a prophet in the midst of the strife with Assyria to imagine and predict a time when Assyria, now Israel's foe, and therefore God's, should be called the work of the Lord's hands (Isaiah xix. 25). The tender care for the stranger manifested in all three great strata of Pentateuchal legislation (in spite of Stade's sneer, Vol. I., p. 510, n. 3), together with the varying pictures of the conversion of the nations to the knowledge of God, must always remain sufficient evidence of the largeness of heart and view to which the old Israelite religion could rise. Side by side too with the particularist efforts of Ezra and his school ran another feeling, which found expression partly, perhaps, in directly polemical utterances such as Jonah, Isaiah lvi. 1-8, and Ruth, but also in several of the Psalms, the writers of which were at the same time very probably the faithful followers of the Law. (Compare Psalm lxxxvii., xxii. 28, etc.)

¹ The philosophic interpretation of Malachi i. 11 seems to me too strangely unusual to be safely cited as one of the "many moods" of the prophets upon this subject. Would that this doubt did not exist! It should, however, be stated that Kuenen, Stade, and many other scholars accept it, while Cheyne in his article, "The Invisible Church in Hebrew Prophecy" (*Monthly Interpreter*, 1885, p. 77), regards it as "the only tenable" explanation.

It must also be remembered that the universalist side of Judaism is not forgotten even in the Rabbinic literature. The ascription of the cause of the dispersion to the making of proselytes, and the beautiful, if childlike, image of God weeping over the drowned Egyptians, and chiding his angels for their song of triumph, are certainly far overbalanced by other opposite passages; but comparatively few as these universalist sayings may be, they yet kept the light from being quenched, and thus helped forward the coming of the time when the universalism of the prophets, purified from its dross and separated from its merely local and temporary elements, should become an unquestioned constituent of Judaism.

III.

In most books of the Old Testament God and Israel are the two poles of the religious idea; with us they are God and man. This difference is commonly made much of in books on Old Testament theology, but here again we must beware of exaggeration. It is quite true that the relation of God to each human soul, which to us seems the very kernel of religion, is far less accentuated in the older books of the Scriptures than in modern times, or even than in the New Testament. The individual recedes behind the community; it is Israel as an abiding whole which is of first importance, not the single units who appear upon the stage only to vanish from off it. Israel's religious value consists in its continuity and self-identity from age to age. There is something sublime in that complete assimilation of personal interests with those of the community which, as it would now seem, has enabled so many of the Psalmists' personifications to escape detection from the majority of critics up till the present day.¹ Yet, though the command to love God is addressed to Israel as a whole, each single member of the nation is personally bound by the mandate, and though all the Psalms be "national," no Psalmist speaks of sorrows, joys, or desires which he has not himself personally experienced.

At the same time it must be conceded that the personification of a community in antiquity is a very different thing from a mere poetical figure. The solidarity is so real that it

¹ Compare Smend, *Ueber das Ich der Psalmen*. Z. A. W., 1888, p. 49ff. The personification theory is, however, a return to the old homiletic interpretation of the Synagogue. Smend probably rides his hobby too hard. Compare Nowack's judicious remarks in the *Einleitung* to his new edition of Hupfeld's Psalms, p. x., and Schuurman-Stekhoven in Z. A. W., 1889, p. 131.

carries with it most important consequences, and when reflection begins, suggests many a moral problem.

Upon the assumed solidarity of a city or nation the Deity is frequently supposed to act in the earlier periods. This solidarity extends from the dead to the living, and exercises its influence in the direction of mercy as well as in that of punishment. I need not multiply examples. Ten good men would be sufficient to procure forgiveness for all Sodom. For the sins of Manasseh the captivity is predicted upon his descendants. David sins, and his child dies. He is tempted to number Israel, and a plague kills many thousands of the people.¹ Ahaz is penitent, and his punishment is postponed for his son. Another plague is due to Saul's cruelty against the Gibeonites, and the execution of Saul's sons becomes its expiation. Sin accumulates generation by generation. The ages that had to elapse till the Canaanites' measure of guilt was full, and till the fated season of their punishment had arrived, needed the lengthy sojourning of the Israelites in Egypt.² Such is the Divine Law. For God visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the third and fourth generations of those that hate him. But love extends its influence yet further, for God "shows mercy to the thousandth generation of those that love him."³ In after years, when the nation was becoming weary and saddened under oppression and trouble, the weight of the fathers' sins seemed a burden too hard to bear. Individualism was awakening, even in its denial. "Our fathers have eaten sour grapes," men said, "and the children's teeth are set on edge." Then came the Deuteronomist, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and they declared that individualism was the proper law of punishment both for God and man.⁴ "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear in (Q. P. B.) the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear in the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

¹ David is, however, made to suggest that the solidarity ought not to extend beyond his own house: "These sheep what have they done?" (2 Samuel xxiv. 17.)

² Compare also 2 Samuel iii. 29; xii. 10; 1 Kings ii. 33; xi. 12; 2 Kings v. 27; viii. 19; x. 30, xiii. 23; 2 Chron. xxi. 14; Isaiah xiv. 21; Jer. xxxii. 18; Lev. xx. 5; Job v. 4; xxi. 19; Psalm lxxix. 8; cix. 14; Neh. i. 6; Daniel ix. 16.

³ The Deuteronomist is bound to quote the second commandment as he found it, but his own view is not only given in xxiv. 16, but also in vii. 9, 10. God's mercy extends to a thousand generations, but those that hate him he repays to their face.

⁴ Yet it must be noted that Jeremiah strictly only asserts that the proverb shall have no force or truth in the Messianic age.

It cannot be said, however, that individualism ever became a significant feature of the old Hebrew religion. Where, as in the Psalms, there is the intensest religious feeling, it is, nevertheless, if critics such as Smend see rightly, experienced in close connection with the whole community. Take Psalm li. for instance. It is quite certain that the Psalmist tells the lessons of his own life; but at the same time verse 6 (Heb.) makes it clear that a national reference is also intended. The wisdom literature is far more individual, and yet its degree of religious intensity is lower. The priestly legislation recognises the solidarity of the community in a marked manner by the institution of the national sin offering. The idea conveyed in the old story of Achan, by which the sin of a single man spreads its fatal influence more and more widely till it taints with the pollution of its guilt the entire people, was only very gradually overcome.

There is indeed no deeper problem in the philosophy of religion than the nature of sin. It is thus no wonder if the usually simple utterances of the Old Testament writers illustrate several different sides of this complex question. Here again there are many moods; whether all the elements of truth can be brought together under a single conception that shall be universally true, and explain equally for each human soul the nature of his sin, may however be doubted. Theories of sin, such as the theory of St. Paul, are not, even if true for many, necessarily true for all.

Apart from the allegory in Genesis ii., there is no theory of the origin of sin to be found in the Old Testament, and that chapter seems to have had no influence whatever upon later teaching. Man who is flesh and not spirit is liable to error and wrong doing. "There is no man that sinneth not." Such is the general view. Jeremiah, indeed, thought that there was an inherent deceitfulness about the heart, a sore sickness which God alone could cure (Jer. xvii. 9, 14; x. 23). The direful consequences of sin led to the mistaken¹ view that there was something almost supernatural about it, as if sin were a kind of eternal power which God may use as a snare to bring about a greater punishment. The tendency towards solidarity comes in once more. The sins of one generation seemed a force that created sinfulness in the next, one link of sin bringing with it another. Traces

¹ Theologians seem sometimes to speak of sin as Realist philosophers used to speak of kinds—as something real over and above the particular sins of individuals. Unless we believe in a devil, this idea is surely a fiction. Yet Holtzmann (Stade II., p. 304), commenting on Sirach xvii. 20 seems to accept it.

of these views, together with remonstrances against them, are to be found. Thus to an early writer in the books of Samuel the sin of David in numbering the people seemed due to the direct temptation of God (2 Samuel xxiv. 1). The Chronicler long afterwards was willing to believe that the sin was caused by supernatural influence; the agent however is no longer God, but Satan (1 Chronicles xxi. 1). The hardening of Pharaoh's heart and of Sihon's (Deut. ii. 30) is scarcely in point, because it was done for the benefit of Israel (compare Joshua xi. 20). But an interesting verse in Isaiah lxiii. is very significant, as showing the perplexity into which long-lasting affliction, half deserved and half wanton, had thrown many a troubled spirit in the exile period. "O Lord, why dost thou make us to err from thy ways, and harden our hearts from thy fear." The text of Isaiah lxiv. 5 is unfortunately corrupt, but seems to imply the idea that, by its long continuance from age to age, sin had become a kind of chain in which the wrath of God had fettered the community, and from the bonds of which they could not shake themselves free. More simple is the expression in Lamentations v. 7. "Our fathers have sinned and are not, and we have borne their iniquities." And even the prediction in Lev. xxvi. (an exilic chapter with marked affinities to Ezekiel) accepts this sombre belief: "They that are left of you shall pine away for their iniquity in your enemies' lands; *and also for the iniquities of their fathers with them* (i.e., as well as of themselves, Q.P.B.) shall they pine away." Ezekiel, on the other hand, whose strong accentuation of man's free capacity to turn from good to bad and from bad to good brings other difficulties in its train, rebukes with a noble scorn the dark superstition that the curse of God is the origin of sin.¹

His contemporaries had used the same argument as we find in Isaiah lxiii., "If our transgressions and our sins are upon us and we pine away in them, how then should we live" (xxxiii. 10). Ezekiel replies that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked: a man has only to turn from his evil ways that he may live. The prophet is clearly of opinion, first, that there is no divine or satanic power which impels a man to sin, and secondly that in the moral sphere each man can act independently of his community, and even of his parents. There is no constraining force which induces sin and punishment apart from a man's own will. Whereas the popular view, represented also in the quotation from Leviticus,

¹ But compare Ezekiel xxiv. 23.

regards the sin of a community as a sort of spiritual snowball ; sin begets sin, and the amount is accumulated generation after generation, till at last it seems impossible for the bearers of this heaped up store of iniquity to rid themselves of the burden. Ezekiel repudiates this doctrine ; according to his teaching in the 18th and 33rd chapters of his book each man starts his life with a blank judgment sheet ; his fathers' sins are not laid to his account, and they do not lessen his capacity for a righteous life.

Into the nature of sin the Hebrew writers and preachers enquired as little curiously as they did into its origin. Sin to them is simply a transgression of God's will or commandments. To the prophets God's injunctions are twofold : they forbid idolatry, they enjoin morality. The Law extended the range of sin much more widely : to eat fat is as much a sin as to commit adultery. Hence the introduction of the Law developed the idea of "secret" or "unconscious sins," errors into which a man might fall without his knowledge, a conception entirely foreign to the earlier prophets. But with this increase in the range of sin, and under the current conception that misfortune was equivalent to punishment, it became all the more usual in times of trouble to bewail the iniquities the commission of which must have caused the distress.¹ A different mood, on the other hand, is discernible in some of the Maccabean psalms ; there the "Saints," the *חסידים*, in whose mouth is a hymn to God, in whose hand a two-edged sword (cxlix.), are not conscious of any defiling guilt. They complain, "All this is come upon us, yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant." Not for their sins, but yet "for God's sake," are they "killed all the day long" (xliv. 22).

How is a sinful man or a sinful community to become free from sin ? Here, again, there are divers moods to be recorded. The primary view is that man must and can turn from the wickedness of his ways and rid himself of his sin. "Wash you, make you clean," cries Isaiah, "Put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes ; cease to do evil, learn to do well." The Prophet does not imagine that there is anything to prevent his hearers from "ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well," if they please. And exhortations of this kind are not foreign to any period of the prophetic ministry. Every preacher will naturally urge his audience to struggle for their own amendment, and none would deny that such struggles may be crowned with success. At the same time,

¹ Compare Daniel ix. 5 ; Neh. i. 6 ; Psalm cvi. 6.

the idea that it is in man's unaided power to pass from sin to virtue was to some extent checked in certain minds and at certain periods by two important considerations. The first of these we have noticed already. It is that each unit is one of a community and shares in that community's sin, and perhaps also in the sin of its forefathers. The weight of sin which the individual feels attached to himself is thereby greatly increased, and the difficulty to be rid of it is also correspondingly augmented. Secondly, the conception of sin was deepened, and passed into that of sinfulness, that is to say, it seemed to some minds as if the sinful nature which had been produced by sin could not be cleansed by the human will alone. When the set of the soul was directed towards wrongdoing, it could not, by its own effort, unhelpt by an outside and diviner power, be turned in the contrary direction. Hence, perhaps, it may be explained that we find traces of a feeling that the thorough eradication of sin must be God's work and not man's. This view is chiefly prominent in passages dating from the exile, and dealing with the messianic age, as if the writers felt that the spiritual regeneration of Israel, as well as the material regeneration of nature, must need the special intervention of God. The illustrative passages come from Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and are all very much of the same kind. They are often placed in curious juxtaposition with other passages in which the same spiritual changes in the heart, which in the first series are ascribed to God, are there demanded from the unaided effort of man. Jeremiah (xxiv. 7) predicts that God will give Israel one heart to know him; he will cleanse them from their iniquity (xxxiii. 8), and put his teaching in their inward parts and write it on their hearts (xxx. 33). Ezekiel also foretells the granting of one heart and a new spirit, a time when the stony heart shall be removed and a heart of flesh given in its place. Then shall the people be able to walk in the ordinances of their God (xi. 19, 20). The new spirit is God's spirit, the spirit of true life (xxxvi. 26; xxxvii. 14). Yet, at the end of his eighteenth chapter, he urges the people to get this new heart for themselves: "Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" Are we to assume that the Prophet passed from one to another of these utterances without being aware of any contrariety between them, and that at one time the one and at a second time the other of two apparently, but no really, conflicting sides of a complex truth was more vividly present to his

mind? With these passages in Ezekiel and Jeremiah may be compared the messianic prediction of Zephaniah, which takes a wider range than Israel. "Then will I turn to the peoples a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent." In a verse of Deuteronomy, the aid of God seems promised to crown the human effort with a more glorious issue. "If," so runs the prediction in xxx. 4 (a chapter clearly considerably later than the main bulk of the Deuteronomy of Josiah) "thou shalt return" (*i.e.*, in the land of captivity) "unto the Lord thy God, and shalt obey his voice with all thine heart and with all thy soul," "then (verse 6) the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart and the heart of thy seed to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

All these passages are messianic. But there are a few others, mainly in the Psalms, which show that even for the present and every day life of the community, the divine help was thought by some (in the post-exilic period chiefly?) to be needful for the living of a good life and for the conquest over sin. "Shew me thy way," "teach me to do thy will," are not unfrequent prayers in the Psalter (compare xxv. 5, xxvii. 11, cxliii. 10, cxxxix. 24, etc. 1 Ch. xxix. 18, 19, is also of value). More significant still is the bidding, "let me not wander from thy command," or "hold thou me up, and I shall be safe" (cxix. 10, 117). The double aspect of the human relation with God is mystically expressed in Psalm lxiii. 9: "My soul followeth hard after thee: thy right hand upholdeth me." Noticeable are the prayers in Jeremiah and Lamentations: "Heal me, O Lord, and I shall be healed; save me, and I shall be saved" (Jeremiah xvii. 14). "Turn thou us unto thee, O Lord, and we will return" (Lamentations v. 21; compare Jeremiah xxxi. 19; Psalm lxxx. and lxxxv. 5).¹

It is a development of the doctrine implied in the prayer of Lamentations if we find it stated in Jeremiah, "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not for man that walketh to direct his steps" (x. 23); or again in

¹ Upon Psalm lxxxv. 5 the Midrash, in a passage quoted and improved upon by Dr. Frankl in one of his sermons, moralises thus: "The sons of Korah said, 'How long wilt thou say (to Israel), Turn, O backsliding children (Jeremiah iii. 14); and shall Israel say to thee, Turn thou first, as it is said, Return, O Lord, how long (Psalm xc. 13), and wilt thou say to Israel, Nay, turn ye first, [as it is said, O Israel, return unto the Lord thy God (Hosea xiv. 1)]'; thou wilt not turn by thyself, and we will not turn by ourselves, but let us both turn together and at once, as it is said, Turn thou with us, O God of our salvation.'" Frankl, *Fest- und Gelegenheits-Predigten*, 1888, p. 31. The Midrash (Tillim, *ad loc.*) translates שׁוּבָנִי "Turn thou with us."

Proverbs, "Man's goings are of the Lord; how can a man then understand his own way?" (xx. 24). Here the cry for help that meets us in Lamentations seems turning into a kind of restrictive fatalism. What is true without exaggeration in living experience seems onesided and doubtful when twisted into a theory. This could even happen in the case of the noble Psalm li., with its almost unique prayer for the help of God's holy spirit in the struggle with sin. The view that sin is not to be overcome without that divine aid has never been expressed more purely or with intenser conviction. "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a firm spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence, and take not thy holy spirit from me."

The labels "good" and "sinful" are applied in different ages to different deeds. The pre-prophetic period (*i.e.* the period before Amos), though we may, I think rightly, refuse to believe that Stade's too depreciatory estimate of it is correct,¹ possessed, even in the minds of zealous Yahveh worshippers such as Elijah, a lower ideal than that of an Isaiah or a Micah. Thus the cruelties of Jehu, which God is made to sanction and approve in 2 Kings x. 30, are become such an abomination to Hosea, that for their sake the whole kingdom of Israel is to be visited with ruin. In a tradition respecting Samuel, the utter destruction of the Amalekites is the divine command, deflection from which is a grievous sin; in Jonah, the very cattle, the saving of which Samuel censures in God's name, are a reason for God to spare the Ninevites from destruction.²

A variety of mood of extreme importance is roughly characterised by the opposition between the prophets and the Law in regard to "external" and "internal" religion, or more accurately in their respective attitudes towards ceremonial observances. To estimate this difference truly, and yet without exaggeration, it is necessary to remember the date at which the Law became an important factor in the religious life of Israel.

Up to the time when Deuteronomy was accepted by Josiah

¹ *Geschichte*, Vol. I., p. 573.

² Compare too the different views of the monarchy in 1 Samuel. To the "theocratic" chronicler the kingdom was a desertion from God and a grievous sin; to the older narrator it was a meritorious unification of the tribes. Though usually the kingdom of the Ten Tribes is regarded as the illegitimate result of a rebellion against the divinely appointed house of David, one passage at least from the pen of an Ephraimite still records for us the other side of the question. "Hear, Yahveh, the voice of Judah, and bring him back unto his people" (Deut. xxxiii. 17, with Dillmann's commentary).

as the binding law for the individual and the state, the teachers of Israel under the monarchy may have shown some respect towards the holy customs of antiquity, but were unaware of the existence of any authoritative code claiming a divine sanction. It does not appear as if the small Book of the Covenant (Exodus xxi.-xxiii.), or the laws contained in Exodus xxxiv. were ever publicly recognised as binding till they were absorbed and modified by Deuteronomy. Thus, up till the date of that book's composition and publication, the prophets, that is such men as Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, sought no other or higher guide for their teaching than their own inspiration. Jeremiah, a contemporary of the Deuteronomist, seems to take up a varying attitude towards his book. At first he may have hoped that great things would follow from its adoption. The Covenant mentioned in his eleventh chapter, disobedience against which is threatened with a curse, seems to refer to Deuteronomy.¹ But very shortly the prophet, in his zeal for the unattainable ideal, must have perceived that the compromise of Deuteronomy produced no better fruits than the unalloyed moral teaching of his prophetic predecessors. No prophet has spoken out more vehemently against the value and even the validity of sacrifices than Jeremiah. "The ark of the covenant" is to be forgotten, and never made again; the temple of the Lord is no safeguard against the coming ruin. Contrast this with Isaiah's secure trust in the indestructibility of Jerusalem and of the temple upon Zion. There is not so much about sacrifices in Deuteronomy as in the later priestly legislation, but yet the perfect Israelite of Deuteronomy could certainly not neglect these outward exhibitions of piety. However we may try to soften the meaning of Jeremiah's words, they sound strangely in contrast with many a verse of Josiah's code. (Deuteronomy, be it remembered, represents its legislation as Mosaic.) "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices." How utterly impossible such a sentence would be in any writer after Nehemiah. Ezekiel, here as elsewhere, represents an intermediate stage between the earlier prophets and the later Law. He does not refer to an authoritative Mosaic code, but he lays stress upon matters of ritual and purity, and devotes many chapters of his book to new laws for future use respecting the priests, the temple

¹ See Cheyne, *Jeremiah*, p. 56, 167; Marti, *Der Prophet Jeremia von Anatot*, p. 17.

and the sacrifices.¹ After the return, while we find Haggai urging the rebuilding of the sanctuary, Zechariah, high as is the place he assigns to Joshua, the high priest, gives the true prophet's answer to the enquiry as to the fasts and their continuance. Some twenty years after Zechariah comes the work of Ezra and his school, the introduction of the Law and its perfervid adoption as the final and authoritative code of God. How the Law or Pentateuch, for all the parts of the so-called five books of Moses were now at last welded together into a single whole, was able so admirably to win the devoted affection of the people at large; how it became gradually identified with the entire religion of Israel, and unquestionably accepted as Mosaic from end to end, this is not the place to enquire. But the final exhortation of Malachi represents the accomplishment of this process, and with its entirely new appeal to the written Mosaic Law, unnamed before by the whole series of Malachi's predecessors it sounds the death knell of prophecy. The written Law of God rendered the spoken message from him unnecessary.

The Pentateuch, as we now possess it, is a kind of compromise between the natural desire of man for an external embodiment of religion, and the prophet's too difficult identification of it with the doing of justice, the love of "mercy," and the walking humbly before God. The dangers to which the Law led cannot here be pointed out, nor, on the other hand, can I attempt a defence of the legal school from the unfair attacks to which they are too commonly subjected by Christian theologians. Levitical or Rabbinical religion is a theory of religion, and is, therefore, not without its moral risks. Pauline religion is also a theory of religion, and has equally its moral dangers. The religion of the prophets and the religion of Jesus are not theories; they are natural, immediate and inspired. But by the masses of the people theories of religion are most easily followed. Hence the success of Rabbinism and Paulinism alike. But just as it is unfair to judge Paulinism from the excesses of Antinomians, so is it equally unfair to judge Rabbinism from the bad Pharisees who were attacked by Jesus.²

A few examples of spiritual moods that have their roots in the Law are not without their interest. Professor Smend

¹ Notice how the tests of a good life include at least one matter of *Sitte* elevated into a mark of outward religious purity. Ezekiel xviii. 6; compare Lev. xviii. 19; xx. 18.

² Whether they were as bad as Jesus in his zeal imagined may however be doubted; similarly in the case of the "false prophets" and Jeremiah. Compare also Wellhausen's *Die Pharisäer und die Saducäer*, p. 127, one of this author's innumerable brilliant and telling passages.

has recently pointed out the important place occupied by the temple in a large portion of the Psalter.¹ It is curious to note how some of the noblest spiritual passages in the Psalms are connected with the love of the temple upon the hill of Zion. All such psalms are doubtless post-exilic. (Sometimes Professor Smend has, I think, narrowed the House of God too exclusively to the material temple, where a higher meaning is intended, but even these passages start from the temple made by hands, though they rise to the larger sanctuary that is not.²) Psalms lxxv., lxxxiv., lxiii., and xlii., for example, should be studied in this connection. Psalm cxix. and the second portion of Psalm xix. are interesting specimens of the high spiritual influence which the Law could exercise upon many a pious believer. How entirely these Psalms demolish the theory of the bondage of the Law. And the Talmud, if the Rabbins had only been more poetical, would assuredly have been full of similar hymns. The true disciple of the Rabbins has always managed to transfigure the most external and uninteresting prescripts of the Law with a spiritual light, which no one, at all infected with the spirit of criticism, can ever hope to see or even adequately to understand.³

V.

A simple piety even at the end of the nineteenth century can find all the religious ideas which are precious to it within the Old Testament literature. Those who are unable to achieve a similar amount of *Hineinlesen* must content themselves with the view that no book can contain complete religious perfection, because religion, like all other partly human creations, is subject to the law of development. They will not, on the other hand, foolishly attempt to run counter to the highest wisdom of mankind in spiritual things by seeking to minimise the value of conceptions which in their fulness are foreign to the Old Testament thinkers, or which perchance have been largely accentuated in one form or another by an alien or younger creed. On the contrary any germs of these ideas, now precious to ourselves as well as to

¹ Smend, *Ueber die Bedeutung des Jerusalemischen Tempels*, etc., *Studien und Kritiken*, 1884, p. 704.

² Compare "Mystic Passages in the Psalms," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. I., p. 143.

³ Another curious instance of a mood that lies between "legalism" and "prophetism" is a passage in the post-exilic Joel. "Turn ye to me with all your hearts, and with fasting and with weeping, and with smiting of the breast." But the next verse begins, "Rend your heart, and not your garments."

civilisation at large, that we may discover in the Old Testament scriptures, we shall hail with satisfaction.

It is a false charge brought against the Old Testament religion that it is eudæmonistic or utilitarian. All theistic religions must be to some extent eudæmonistic, because they must all believe that God in the last resort proportions reward to desert, according to some law of justice. It makes no difference whether the reward is expected in this world or in another. The eudæmonism is just the same. Jesus would not have said "Rejoice and be exceeding glad when men revile you and persecute you," if he could not have added in the same breath, "for great is your reward in heaven." On the other hand the virtue and duty of self-sacrifice are not so plainly taught in the Old Testament scriptures as we should teach them in any hand-book of practical ethics which we might compile to-day.

The comparative absence of this teaching is connected with the general view that suffering and misfortune are always evils, and this view again is doubtless partly dependent upon the want of any belief in a happy or compensatory future life. Yet even here there are indications of another "mood." That suffering may discipline is indicated more than once. "Happy," says Eliphaz, "is the man whom God correcteth" (Job v. 17). "My son," so runs the exhortation of the wise man, "despise not the chastening of the Lord; neither be weary of his correction, for whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth" (Proverbs iii. 11, 12; compare Deut. viii. 5). "Happy is the man whom thou chastenest," exclaims one Psalmist, and another, trained, as we must remember, under the Law, is glad for his sorrow, because "before I was afflicted I went astray, but now I have kept thy word" (Psalm cxix. 67, 71; compare Lam. iii. 27). Sacrifice for religion's sake was illustratively shown in the days of Antiochus and the revolt of the Maccabees; when, as the Psalmist complains, God seemed to have cast off and put to shame, and yet for his sake his faithful servants were "killed all the day long" (Psalm xliv. 22). And, finally, the conception of labour, suffering and death for the sake of others is luminously set forth in the picture of the suffering servant who takes upon himself the sins of others. No passage in any literature has had, I should imagine, an influence at all comparable to that of the fifteen verses in Isaiah which describe the servant's office and suffering, his death and his triumph. It always seems to me an unfortunate thing that the ideas contained in that chapter and in the few cognate verses elsewhere (xlii. 1-7; xlix. 1-7;

l. 4-6) should have been so strangely neglected by all later stages of Judaism, and that it should have been reserved for the founder and teachers of Christianity to raise them to their proper level of importance among the spiritual possessions of mankind.

The growth of the doctrine, both of the resurrection of the body and the immortality of the soul, must be sought in the large blank page between the Old Testament and the New. It is only the beginnings of these beliefs which we can find in the older Scriptures. These beginnings, such as the outlook upon an indefinitely prolonged life in communion with God, as we find it in Psalms xlix., lxxii., and xvi., the doubtful allusions in Ecclesiastes, the fuller teaching of a resurrection in Daniel, and the prophecy of death's annihilation and the quickening of the dead in those four mysterious and very late chapters of Isaiah (xxiv.-xxvii.),¹ need not be quoted here in detail. When hopes and glimpses such as these met and mingled with the Platonic teaching of immortality, it was not unlikely, strange though the union was, that spiritual fruit of costly price would be its issue. And such fruit we find in that curious product of Jewish-Alexandrian culture, the Wisdom of Solomon. There, as Professor Cheyne has pointed out, the very knowledge which to the Psalmist is a reason for humbly remembering the shortness and frailty of life, is to the Alexandrian sage *ρίζα ἀθανασίας*, a root of immortality. That heroic self-abandonment² of the Old Testament trust in God receives in his book its final justification. *Δίκαιων δὲ ψυχὰι ἐν χειρὶ Θεοῦ, . . . ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης.* "The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, . . . their hope is full of immortality."

C. G. MONTEFIORE.

¹ Compare Smend, *Anmerkungen zu Jesaiah*, 24-27. *Z. A. W.*, 1884, p. 161ff. Vatke, *Biblische Theologie*, page 550, note 2.

² Compare Delitzsch on Psalm xxxix. 8.
